

Proof of an entropy conjecture of Leighton and Moitra

Hüseyin Acan ^{*†}

huseyin.acan@rutgers.edu

Pat Devlin ^{*‡}

prd41@math.rutgers.edu

Jeff Kahn ^{*‡}

jkahn@math.rutgers.edu

Abstract

We prove the following conjecture of Leighton and Moitra. Let T be a tournament on $[n]$ and $\mathfrak{S}_n$ the set of permutations of $[n]$. For an arc uv of T , let $A_{uv} = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \sigma(u) < \sigma(v)\}$.

Theorem. For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, if $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability distribution on $\mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\mathbb{P}(A_{uv}) > 1/2 + \varepsilon$ for every arc uv of T , then the binary entropy of $\mathbb{P}$ is at most $(1 - \vartheta_\varepsilon) \log_2 n!$ for some (fixed) positive ϑ_ε .

When T is transitive the theorem is due to Leighton and Moitra; for this case we give a short proof with a better ϑ_ε .

1 Introduction

In what follows we use $\log$ for $\log_2$ and $H(\cdot)$ for binary entropy. The purpose of this note is to prove the following natural statement, which was conjectured by Tom Leighton and Ankur Moitra [6] (and told to the third author by Moitra in 2008).

Theorem 1. *Let T be a tournament on $[n]$ and σ a random (not necessarily uniform) permutation of $[n]$ satisfying:*

$$\text{for each arc } uv \text{ of } T, \quad \mathbb{P}(\sigma(u) < \sigma(v)) > 1/2 + \varepsilon. \quad (1)$$

AMS 2010 subject classification: 05C20, 05D40, 94A17, 06A07

Key words and phrases: entropy, permutations, tournaments, regularity

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University

[†]Supported by National Science Foundation Fellowship (Award No. 1502650).

[‡]Supported by NSF grant DMS1501962.

Then

$$H(\sigma) \leq (1 - \vartheta) \log n!, \quad (2)$$

where $\vartheta > 0$ depends only on ε .

(We will usually think of permutations as bijections $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$). The original motivation for Leighton and Moitra came mostly from questions about sorting partially ordered sets; see [6] for more on this.

For the special case of *transitive* T , Theorem 1 was proved in [6] with $\vartheta_\varepsilon = C\varepsilon^4$. Note that for a *typical* (a.k.a. *random*) T , the conjecture’s hypothesis is unachievable, since, as shown long ago by Erdős and Moon [2], no σ agrees with T on more than a $(1/2 + o(1))$ -fraction of its arcs. In fact, it seems natural to expect that transitive tournaments are the *worst* instances, being the ones for which the hypothesized agreement is easiest to achieve. From this standpoint, what we do here may be considered somewhat unsatisfactory, as our ϑ ’s are quite a bit worse than those in [6]. For transitive T it’s easy to see [6, Claim 4.14] that one can’t take ϑ greater than 2ε , which seems likely to be close to the truth. We make some progress on this, giving a surprisingly simple proof of the following improvement of [6].

Theorem 2. *For $T, \mathbb{P}, \sigma$ as Theorem 1 with T transitive,*

$$H(\sigma) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)n \log n.$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 3 following brief preliminaries in Section 2. The underlying idea is similar to that of [6], which in turn was based on the beautiful tournament ranking bound of W. Fernandez de la Vega [1]; see Section 3 (end of “Sketch”) for an indication of the relation to [6]. Theorem 2 is proved in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

Usage

In what follows we assume n is large enough to support our arguments and pretend all large numbers are integers.

As usual $G[X]$ is the subgraph of G induced by X ; we use $G[X, Y]$ for the bipartite subgraph induced (in the obvious sense) by disjoint X and Y . For a digraph D , $D[X]$ and $D[X, Y]$ are used analogously. For both graphs and digraphs, we use $|\cdot|$ for number of edges (or arcs).

Also as usual, the *density* of a pair (X, Y) of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ is $d(X, Y) = d_G(X, Y) = |G[X, Y]|/(|X||Y|)$, and we extend this to bipartite digraphs D in which

$$\text{at most one of } D \cap (X \times Y), D \cap (Y \times X) \text{ is nonempty.} \quad (3)$$

For a digraph D , D^r is the digraph gotten from D by reversing its arcs.

Write $\mathfrak{S}_n$ for the set of permutations of $[n]$. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, we use T_σ for the corresponding (transitive) tournament on $[n]$ (that is, $uv \in T_\sigma$ iff $\sigma(u) < \sigma(v)$) and for a digraph D (on $[n]$) define

$$\text{fit}(\sigma, D) = |D \cap T_\sigma| - |D^r \cap T_\sigma|$$

(e.g. when D is a tournament, this is a measure of the quality of σ as a ranking of D).

Regularity

Here we need just Szemerédi's basic notion [7] of a regular pair and a very weak version (Lemma 3) of his Regularity Lemma. As usual a bipartite graph H on disjoint $X \cup Y$ is δ -regular if

$$|d_H(X', Y') - d_H(X, Y)| < \delta$$

whenever $X' \subseteq X$, $Y' \subseteq Y$, $|X'| > \delta|X|$ and $|Y'| > \delta|Y|$, and we extend this in the obvious way to the situation in (3). It is easy to see that if a bigraph H is δ -regular then its bipartite complement is as well; this implies that for a tournament T on $[n]$ and X, Y disjoint subsets of $[n]$,

$$T \cap (X \times Y) \text{ is } \delta\text{-regular if and only if } T \cap (Y \times X) \text{ is.} \quad (4)$$

The following statement should perhaps be considered folklore, though similar results were proved by János Komlós, circa 1991 (see [5, Sec. 7.3]).

Lemma 3. *For each $\delta > 0$ there is a $\beta > 2^{-\delta^{-O(1)}}$ such that for any bigraph H on $X \cup Y$ with $|X|, |Y| \geq n$, there is a δ -regular pair (X', Y') with $X' \subseteq X$, $Y' \subseteq Y$ and each of $|X'|, |Y'|$ at least βn .*

Corollary 4. *For each $\delta > 0$, β as in Lemma 3 and digraph $G = (V, E)$, there is a partition $L \cup R \cup W$ of V such that $E \cap (L \times R)$ is δ -regular and $\min\{|L|, |R|\} \geq \beta|V|/2$.*

Proof. Let $X \cup Y$ be an (arbitrary) equipartition of V and apply Lemma 3 to the undirected graph H underlying the digraph $G \cap (X \times Y)$. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 1

We now assume that σ drawn from the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathfrak{S}_n$ satisfies (1) and try to show (2) (with ϑ TBA). We use $\mathbb{E}$ for expectation w.r.t. $\mathbb{P}$ and μ for uniform distribution on $\mathfrak{S}_n$.

Sketch and connection with [6]

We will produce $S_1, \dots, S_m \subseteq T$ with $S_i \subseteq L_i \times R_i$ for some disjoint $L_i, R_i \subseteq [n]$, satisfying:

- (i) with $\|S_i\| := \min\{|L_i|, |R_i|\}$, $\sum \|S_i\| = \Omega(n \log n)$ (where the implied constant depends on ε);
- (ii) each S_i is δ -regular (with $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon$ TBA);
- (iii) for all $i < j$, either $(L_i \cup R_i) \cap (L_j \cup R_j) = \emptyset$ or $L_j \cup R_j$ is contained in one of L_i, R_i (note this implies the S_i 's are disjoint).

Let $A_i = \{\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i) > \varepsilon |S_i|\}$ and $Q = \{\sum \{\|S_i\| : A_i \text{ occurs}\} = \Omega(n \log n)\}$. The main points are then:

- (a) $\mathbb{P}(Q)$ is bounded below by a positive function of ε . (This is just (i) together with a couple applications of Markov's Inequality.)
- (b) Regularity of S_i implies $\mu(A_i) \leq \exp[-\Omega(\|S_i\|)]$.
- (c) Under (iii), for any $I \subseteq [m]$,

$$\mu(\cap_{i \in I} A_i) < \exp[-\sum_{i \in I} \Omega(\|S_i\|)]$$

(a weak version of independence of the A_i 's under μ).

And these points easily combine to give (2) (see (6) and (8)).

For the transitive case in [6] most of this argument is unnecessary; in particular, regularity disappears and there is a natural *decomposition* of T into S_i 's: Supposing $T = \{ab : a < b\}$ and (for simplicity) $n = 2^k$, we may take the S_i 's to be the sets $L_i \times R_i$ with (L_i, R_i) running over pairs

$$([(2s-2)2^{-j}n+1, (2s-1)2^{-j}n], [(2s-1)2^{-j}n+1, 2s2^{-j}n]), \quad (5)$$

with $j \in [k]$ and $s \in [2^{j-1}]$. (As mentioned earlier, this decomposition of the (identity) permutation $(1, \dots, n)$ also provides the framework for [1].)

After some translation, our argument (really, a fairly small subset thereof) then specializes to essentially what's done in [6]. $\square$

Set $\delta = .03\varepsilon$ and let β be half the β of Lemma 3 and Corollary 4. We use the corollary to find a rooted tree $\mathcal{T}$ each of whose internal nodes has degree (number of children) 2 or 3, together with disjoint subsets $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m$ of (the arc set of) T , corresponding to the internal nodes of $\mathcal{T}$. The nodes of $\mathcal{T}$ will be subsets of $[n]$ (so the *size*, $|U|$, of a node U is its size as a set).

To construct $\mathcal{T}$, start with root $V_1 = [n]$ and repeat the following for $k = 1, \dots$ until each unprocessed node has size less than (say) $t := \sqrt{n}$. Let V_k be an unprocessed node of size at least t and apply Corollary 4 to $T[V_k]$ to produce a partition $V_k = L_k \cup R_k \cup W_k$, with $|L_k|, |R_k| > \beta|V_k|$ and $S_k := T \cap (L_k \times R_k)$ δ -regular of density at least $1/2$. (Note (4) says we can reverse the roles of L_k and R_k if the density of $T \cap (L_k \times R_k)$ is less than $1/2$.) Add L_k, R_k, W_k to $\mathcal{T}$ as the children of V_k and mark V_k “processed.” (Note the V_k 's are the *internal* nodes of $\mathcal{T}$; nodes of size less than t are not processed and are automatically leaves. Note also that there is no restriction on $|W_k|$ and that, for $k > 1$, V_k is equal to one of L_i, R_i, W_i for some $i < k$.)

Let m be the number of internal nodes of $\mathcal{T}$ (the final tree). Note that the leaves of $\mathcal{T}$ have size at most t and that the S_i 's satisfy (ii) and (iii) of the proof sketch; that they also satisfy (i) is shown by the next lemma.

Set

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m |V_i|;$$

this quantity will play a central role in what follows.

Lemma 5. $\Lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}n \log_3 n$

Proof. This will follow easily from the next general (presumably known) observation, for which we assume $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree satisfying:

- the nodes of $\mathcal{T}$ are subsets of S , an s -set which is also the root of $\mathcal{T}$;
- the children of each internal node U of $\mathcal{T}$ form a partition of U with at most b blocks;
- the leaves of $\mathcal{T}$ are $U_1, \dots, U_r$, with $|U_i| = u_i \leq t$ (any t) and depth d_i .

Lemma 6. *With the setup above, $\sum u_i d_i \geq s \log_b(s/t)$.*

(Of course this is exact if $\mathcal{T}$ is the complete b -ary tree of depth d and all leaves have size $2^{-b}s$).

Proof. Recall that the *relative entropy* between probability distributions p and q on $[r]$ is

$$D(p||q) = \sum p_i \log(q_i/p_i) \leq 0$$

(the inequality given by the concavity of the logarithm). We apply this with $p_i = u_i/s$ and q_i the probability that the ordinary random walk down the tree ends at u_i . In particular $q_i \geq b^{-d_i}$, which, with nonpositivity of $D(p||q)$ and the assumption $u_i \leq t$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum (u_i/s) d_i \log b &\geq \sum (u_i/s) \log(1/q_i) \\ &\geq \sum (u_i/s) \log(s/u_i) \geq \log(s/t). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows. $\square$

This gives Lemma 5 since $\sum |V_i| = \sum_U |U| d(U)$, with U ranging over leaves of $\mathcal{T}$ (and $d(\cdot)$ again denoting depth). $\square$

Lemma 7. *The number m of internal nodes of $\mathcal{T}$ is less than n .*

Proof. A straightforward induction shows that the number of leaves of a rooted tree is $1 + \sum (b(w) - 1)$, where w ranges over internal nodes and b denotes number of children. The lemma follows since here the number of leaves is at most n (actually at most $3\sqrt{n}$) and each $d(w)$ is at least 2. $\square$

Recalling that $A_i = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \text{fit}(\sigma, S_i) \geq \varepsilon |S_i|\}$ and that $\mathbb{E}$ refers to $\mathbb{P}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)] \geq 2\varepsilon |S_i|$, which with

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)] \leq \mathbb{P}(A_i) |S_i| + (1 - \mathbb{P}(A_i)) \varepsilon |S_i| \leq (\mathbb{P}(A_i) + \varepsilon) |S_i|$$

gives $\mathbb{P}(A_i) \geq \varepsilon$ (essentially Markov's Inequality applied to $|S_i| - \text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)$).

Set $\xi_i = |V_i| \mathbf{1}_{A_i}$ and $\xi = \sum_i \xi_i$, and let Q be the event $\{\xi \geq \varepsilon \Lambda / 2\}$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i] = |V_i| \mathbb{P}(A_i) \geq \varepsilon |V_i|$, implying $\mathbb{E}[\xi] = \sum \mathbb{E}[\xi_i] \geq \varepsilon \Lambda$, and (since $\xi_i \leq |V_i|$) $\xi \leq \Lambda$; so using Markov's Inequality as above gives $\mathbb{P}(Q) \geq \varepsilon / 2$.

Thus, with σ chosen from $\mathfrak{S}_n$ according to $\mathbb{P}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma) &\leq 1 + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Q)) \log n! + \mathbb{P}(Q) \log |Q| \\ &= 1 + \log n! + \mathbb{P}(Q) \log \mu(Q) \leq 1 + \log n! + (\varepsilon / 2) \log \mu(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

(recall μ is the uniform measure on $\mathfrak{S}_n$).

Let

$$\mathcal{J} = \{I \subseteq [m] : \sum_{i \in I} |V_i| \geq \varepsilon \Lambda / 2\}$$

and, for $I \in \mathcal{J}$, let $A_I = \cap_{i \in I} A_i$. Set

$$b = \varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^3 / 33 \quad (7)$$

(see (12) for the reason for the choice of b). We will show, for each $I \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\mu(A_I) \leq e^{-b\varepsilon\Lambda/2}, \quad (8)$$

which implies

$$\log \mu(Q) = \log \mu(\cup_{I \in \mathcal{J}} A_I) \leq \log |\mathcal{J}| - (b\varepsilon\Lambda \log e)/2 \leq n - (b\varepsilon\Lambda \log e)/2,$$

the second inequality following from $|\mathcal{J}| \leq 2^m$ together with Lemma 7. With $c = \varepsilon^3 \delta \beta^3 / 150 < (b\varepsilon \log_3 e)/4$, this bounds (for large n) the r.h.s. of (6) by

$$(1 - \varepsilon c/2) \log n!,$$

which proves Theorem 1 with $\vartheta = \varepsilon^4 \delta \beta^3 / 300 = \exp[-\varepsilon^{-O(1)}]$. $\square$

The rest of our discussion is devoted to the proof of (8). For a digraph $D \subseteq L \times R$ with L, R disjoint subsets of V , say a pair (X, Y) of disjoint subsets of $[n]$ with $|X| = |L|$, $|Y| = |R|$ is *safe* for D if

$$\text{fit}(\tau, D) < \varepsilon |L| |R| / 4 \quad (9)$$

for every bijection $\tau : L \cup R \rightarrow X \cup Y$ with $\tau(L) = X$ (where $\text{fit}(\tau, D)$ has the obvious meaning). We also say $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is *safe* for D if $(\sigma(L), \sigma(R))$ is. Note that since S_i has density at least $1/2$ in $L_i \times R_i$, the σ 's in A_i are unsafe for S_i .

Lemma 8. *Assume the above setup with $|L| + |R| = l$ and $|L| = \gamma l$, and set $\lambda = 2\delta$ and $\zeta = \varepsilon \delta \gamma (1 - \gamma) / 4$. Let $I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_r$ be the natural partition of $X \cup Y$ into intervals of size λl . If D is δ -regular and*

$$|X \cap I_j| = (\gamma \lambda \pm \zeta) l \quad \forall j \in [r], \quad (10)$$

then (X, Y) is safe for D .

(Of course an *interval* of $Z = \{i_1 < \dots < i_u\}$ is one of the sets $\{i_s, \dots, i_{s+t}\}$.)

Proof. For τ as in the line after (9), let $L_j = L \cap \tau^{-1}(I_j)$ and $R_j = R \cap \tau^{-1}(I_j)$ ($j \in [r]$). Then

$$|\text{fit}(\tau, D)| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} ||D \cap (L_i \times R_j)| - |D \cap (L_j \times R_i)|| + \gamma(1 - \gamma)\lambda l^2. \quad (11)$$

Here the last term is an upper bound on the contribution of pairs contained in the I_j 's: if $|L_j| = \gamma_j |I_j| = \gamma_j \lambda l$ (so $|R_j| = (1 - \gamma_j) \lambda l$ and $\sum \gamma_j = \gamma / \lambda$), then

$$\sum \gamma_j (1 - \gamma_j) \leq \sum \gamma_j - (\sum \gamma_j)^2 / r = (\gamma - \gamma^2) / \lambda$$

gives

$$\sum |L_j| |R_j| = \sum \gamma_j (1 - \gamma_j) \lambda^2 l^2 \leq \gamma (1 - \gamma) \lambda l^2.$$

On the other hand, regularity and (10) (which implies $|L_i| > \delta |L|$ ($= \delta \gamma l$) since $\gamma \lambda - \zeta > \gamma \delta$, and similarly $|R_i| > \delta |R|$) give, for all $i \neq j$,

$$|D \cap (L_i \times R_j)| = (d \pm \delta) |L_i| |R_j|,$$

where d is the density of D . Combining this with (10) bounds each of the summands in (11) by

$$\begin{aligned} & [(d + \delta)(\gamma \lambda + \zeta)((1 - \gamma) \lambda + \zeta) - (d - \delta)(\gamma \lambda - \zeta)((1 - \gamma) \lambda - \zeta)] l^2 \\ & = 2[\lambda \zeta d + \delta(\gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda^2 + \zeta^2)] l^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the r.h.s. of (11) by

$$\left\{ 2 \binom{r}{2} [\lambda \zeta d + \delta(\gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda^2 + \zeta^2)] + \gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda \right\} l^2 < \varepsilon \gamma (1 - \gamma) l^2 / 4.$$

(The main term on the l.h.s. is the one with $\lambda \zeta d$, which, since $r^{-1} = \lambda = 2\delta$, is less than half the r.h.s. The second and third terms are much smaller (the second since δ is much smaller than ε).) $\square$

Corollary 9. *For D and parameters as in Lemma 8, and σ uniform from $\mathfrak{S}_n$,*

$$\Pr(\sigma \text{ is unsafe for } D) < 2r \exp[-2\zeta^2 l / \lambda].$$

Proof. Let $(X, Y) = (\sigma(L), \sigma(R))$. Once we've chosen $X \cup Y$ (determining $I_1, \dots, I_r$), $2 \exp[-2\zeta^2 l / \lambda]$ is the usual Hoeffding bound [3, Eq. (2.3)] on the probability that X violates (10) for a given j . (The bound may be more familiar when elements of $X \cup Y$ are in X independently, but also applies to the *hypergeometric* r.v. $|X \cap I_j|$; see e.g. [4, Thm. 2.10 and (2.12)].) $\square$

Proof of (8). Let

$$B_i = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \sigma \text{ is unsafe for } S_i\}$$

and $B_I = \cap_{i \in I} B_i$. Then $A_i \subseteq B_i$ (as noted above) and (therefore) $A_I \subseteq B_I$. Moreover—perhaps the central point—the B_i 's are independent, since B_i depends only on the relative positions of $\sigma(L_i)$ and $\sigma(R_i)$ within $\sigma(V_i)$.

On the other hand, Corollary 9, applied with $D = S_i$ (so $L = L_i$, $R = R_i$, $l = |L_i| + |R_i|$ and $\gamma = |L_i|/l \in (\beta, 1 - \beta)$) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(B_i) &< 2r \exp[-2\zeta^2 l/\lambda] < 2r \exp[-\varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^2 l/64] \\ &< 2r \exp[-\varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^3 |V_i|/32] < e^{-b|V_i|}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

(Recall b was defined in (7); since we assume $|V_i|$ is large ($|V_i| > t = \sqrt{n}$), the choice leaves a little room to absorb the $2r$.) And of course (12) and the independence of the B_i 's give (8). $\square$

4 Back to the transitive case

Theorem 2 is an easy consequence of the next observation.

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathbf{Y}$ a random m -subset of $[2m]$ satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}|\{(a, b) : a < b, a \in [2m] \setminus \mathbf{Y}, b \in \mathbf{Y}\}| > (\tfrac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)m^2. \quad (13)$$

Then $H(\mathbf{Y}) < (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)2m$.

To get Theorem 2 from this, let $T = \{ab : a < b\}$ and, for simplicity, $n = 2^k$, and decompose $T = \bigcup (L_i \times R_i)$ as in (5). For each i , say with $|L_i| (= |R_i|) = m_i$, let $\mathbf{Y}_i \subseteq [2m_i]$ consist of the indices of positions within $\sigma(L_i \cup R_i)$ occupied by $\sigma(R_i)$; that is, if $\sigma(L_i \cup R_i) = \{j_1 < \dots < j_{2m_i}\}$, then $\mathbf{Y}_i = \{l : j_l \in \sigma(R_i)\}$. Then Lemma 10 (its hypothesis provided by (1)) gives

$$H(\mathbf{Y}_i) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)2m_i;$$

so, since σ is determined by the $\mathbf{Y}_i$'s, we have

$$H(\sigma) \leq \sum H(\mathbf{Y}_i) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8) \sum (2m_i) = (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)n \log n. \quad \square$$

Remark. Note that the $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$ of Theorem 2 is the best one can do without more fully exploiting (1) (that is, beyond (13) for the (L_i, R_i, Y_i) 's, which is all we are using).

Proof of Lemma 10. For $a \in [2m]$, set $\mathbb{P}(a \in \mathbf{Y}) = 1/2 + \delta_a$. Then

$$H(\mathbf{Y}) \leq \sum_a H(1/2 + \delta_a) \leq \sum_a (1 - 2\delta_a^2)$$

(where the 2 could actually be $2 \log e$); so it is enough to show

$$\sum \delta_a^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 m/8.$$

For a given m -subset Y of $[2m]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(Y) &:= |\{(a, b) : a < b, a \in [2m] \setminus Y, b \in Y\}| \\ &= \sum_{b \in Y} (b-1) - \binom{m}{2} = \sum_{b \in Y} b - \binom{m+1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(the first sum counts pairs (a, b) with $a < b$ and $b \in Y$, and $\binom{m}{2}$ is the number of such pairs with a also in Y); so we have

$$(\tfrac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)m^2 < \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum (\tfrac{1}{2} + \delta_b)b - \binom{m+1}{2} = \sum \delta_b b + m^2/2,$$

implying $\sum \delta_b b > \varepsilon m^2$. Combining this with $2m \sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b \geq \sum \delta_b b$, we have $\sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b > \varepsilon m/2$ and then, using Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\sum \delta_b^2 \geq \sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b^2 \geq \frac{1}{2m} (\varepsilon m/2)^2 = \varepsilon^2 m/8. \quad \square$$

References

- [1] W. Fernandez de la Vega, On the maximal cardinality of a consistent set of arcs in a random tournament, *J. Comb. Th. Series B* (1983), 328-332.
- [2] P. Erdős and J. Moon, On sets of consistent arcs in a tournament, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **8** (1965), 269-271.
- [3] W. Hoeffding, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables, *J. Amer. Statistical Assoc.* **58** (1963), 13-30.
- [4] S. Janson, T. Łuczak and A. Ruciński, *Random Graphs*, Wiley, New York, 2000.
- [5] J. Komlós and M. Simonovits, Szemerédi's regularity lemma and its applications in graph theory, *Combinatorics, Paul Erdős is eighty, Vol. 2 (Keszthely, 1993)*, 295-352, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud. 2, János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 1996.
- [6] T. Leighton and A. Moitra, On Entropy and Extensions of Posets, manuscript 2011. <http://people.csail.mit.edu/moitra/docs/poset.pdf>.
- [7] E. Szemerédi, Regular Partitions of Graphs, pp. 399-401 in *Problèmes Combinatoires et Théorie des Graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976)*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), 1978.